

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated October 4, 2005. Claims 9-11 and 13-14 are pending.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yoritomi in view of Takemura and Tagusa. This 3-way Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 as amended requires “forming on the interlayer insulating film a negative type photosensitive transparent conductive material for a pixel electrode whose exposed parts are left in a pattern; performing exposure from a back surface side of the light permeable substrate in order to expose the negative type photosensitive transparent conductive material in a self-alignment fashion by using the gate signal lines and the source signal lines as exposure masks; developing the negative type photosensitive transparent conductive material so as to obtain pixel electrodes of the negative type photosensitive transparent conductive material by removing unexposed parts of the negative type photosensitive transparent conductive material.” Thus, claim 9 has been amended to make clear that the pixel electrode itself is of the negative photosensitive transparent conductive material. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest these features of claim 9.

The Office Action admits that Takemura and Tagusa do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in the last 2 paragraphs of claim 9. Recognizing this flaw in Takemura and Tagusa, the Office Action cites to the new Takemura reference.

However, Takemura also differs from the invention of claim 9 in relevant part. In particular, the resist 411 in Fig. 5C of Takemura is used for patterning and the pixel electrode itself is not of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material. Thus,

Takemura fails to disclose or suggest that the pixel electrode itself is of a negative photosensitive transparent conductive material, in combination with the back side exposure. Moreover, if one were to combine Takemura and Yoritomi (which applicant believes would be incorrect in any event due to a lack of suggestion or motivation), one would use the resist 711 of Takemura and would not have made the pixel electrode of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material as required by claim 9. Thus, it can be seen that there is no suggestion or motivation in the cited art for the alleged combination of making the pixel electrode of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material and using the back side exposure as called for in claim 9.

Claim 9 also stands rejected under Section 103(a) over Kumagai in view of Takemura. This Section 103(a) rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Again, the Office Action relies on Takemura for the subject matter of the last two paragraphs of claim 9. However, Takemura also differs from the invention of claim 9 in relevant part. In particular, the resist 411 in Fig. 5C of Takemura is used for patterning and the pixel electrode itself is not of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material in Takemura. Thus, Takemura fails to disclose or suggest that the pixel electrode itself is of a negative photosensitive transparent conductive material, in combination with the back side exposure. Moreover, if one were to combine Takemura and Kumagai (which applicant believes would be incorrect in any event due to a lack of suggestion or motivation), one would use the resist 711 of Takemura and would not have made the pixel electrode of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material as required by claim 9. Thus, it can be seen that there is no suggestion or motivation in the cited art for the alleged combination of making the

IZUMI et al.
Appl. No. 10/748,140
December 29, 2005


pixel electrode of the claimed negative photosensitive transparent conductive material and using the back side exposure as called for in claim 9.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: _____



Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100